



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/596,221	07/15/1996	THOMAS A. SILVESTRINI	251692002120	5679

7590 05/29/2002

McCutchen Doyle Brown & Enerson LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER

WILLSE, DAVID H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3738

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/596,221

Applicant(s)

SILVESTRINI

Examiner

Dave Willse

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23,24,28,30-37 and 40-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 24, 28, 30-37, and 40-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Newly presented claims 38-41 have been renumbered as claims 40-43 because of the previously canceled method claims 38 and 39 (Preliminary Amendment of May 30, 2000).

The Applicant's reproduction of claims 23, 30, and 36 is inaccurate, as seen from the Amendment of September 8, 1998, and it is recommended for future reference that the Applicant submit clean copies of only those claims being amended or added. The Applicant has failed to *specifically* point out the support in the original disclosure for each of the newly presented claim limitations (M.P.E.P. 714.02). The Applicant has also failed to indicate which of the added claims are readable on the elected species (Paper No. 8).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 23, 24, 28, 30-37, and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Silvestrini, US 5,300,118. Particular attention is directed to Figures 11A and 11B; column 2, lines 13-15; column 3, lines 60-68; column 6, lines 47-50 and 58-60; and column 10, lines 14-27 and 38-42.

Art Unit: 3738

Review of the Applicant's Remarks

In regard to Silvestrini '118, the Applicant asserts that "the specification indicates only a stiff material" (Paper No. 40: page 3, line 10), yet the first sentence of the abstract, among other instances, describes the ring body as being "flexible". Like the Applicant (page 11, lines 3-5, and page 13, lines 33-35, of the instant specification), Silvestrini '118 states that "materials such as those used in making contact lenses can be used" (column 6, lines 58-60). Although the Applicant provides a couple of definitions of "pliable" on page 10, lines 23-32, of the present specification, it is not clear whether arcuate preforms are excluded, particularly in view of the Applicant's Figures 3A and 13A; the sentence on page 18, lines 6-9, of the Applicant's specification; and newly added (and renumbered) claims 40 and 42. And the Silvestrini '118 implants are certainly arcuate and elongated, since the structures "must be *open ended* rings" (column 10, lines 41-44; emphasis added). Moreover, the "elongated ovals" contemplated at column 6, lines 47-50, imply that the corneal insert can be elongated in alternative ways. It should also be noted that the Silvestrini '118 materials are *necessarily* at least partially flexible, since otherwise the split rings could not be inserted into the "annular channel within the cornea" (column 5, lines 35-37); such flexibility is illustrated for another embodiment in Figure 15B.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114.


Art Unit: 3738

See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse, whose telephone number is (703) 308-2903 and who is generally available Monday through Thursday during most of each day. The supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached at (703) 308-2111. The receptionist's phone number is (703) 308-0858, and the main FAX numbers are (703) 305-3591, 3590.

dhw: D. Willse
May 27, 2002


DAVE WILLSE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3738